



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(vol. ii, pp. 56, 57) give further testimony to the same effect. His power was exerted, not directly upon the mass of citizens, but upon those from whom the mass of citizens get their opinions in the end. And, therefore, this book of Mr. Ogden's is less the biography of an individual than it is the revelation of just how the silent but irresistible forces of political and social change are fostered and directed until they have done their perfect work.

HARRY THURSTON PECK.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

The Political History of England, 1801-1837. By GEORGE C. BRODERICK and J. K. FOTHERINGHAM. London and New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1906.—xix, 486 pp.

The eleventh volume of the Hunt and Poole series on English history covers the period from the formation of the Addington ministry to the accession of Queen Victoria. According to the original plan Dr. Broderick, late warden of Merton College, was to have written the volume, with the assistance of Mr. Fotheringham in the portions dealing with foreign politics; but upon the death of the former, in 1903, it fell to Mr. Fotheringham to finish the volume and recast it all for publication—with some of the unhappy results that are unavoidable under such circumstances, especially in the matter of proportion. For instance: the three good chapters on foreign politics after 1815 might very well have been omitted altogether from such a work (which is not a survey of European politics), and the digressions necessary to explain British foreign affairs might have been woven into the narrative with greater effect. Again, the fact that it is called a "political history" will hardly justify giving only twenty inadequate and misleading lines to the trade-union legislation of 1824-25 (p. 204) and leaving Robert Owen out entirely, while devoting two pages (pp. 310-312) to the cholera epidemic and almost a page to the burning of the Houses of Parliament (p. 349).

About one-third of the volume is occupied with a clear and readable narration of the Napoleonic conflict and its attendant domestic politics; the great reform bill and its immediate results fill three chapters; the religious movements, poor-law reform, literature and social progress are disposed of in two chapters; India during the period gets one chapter; and Peel and Melbourne one. Military campaigns, party politics, leading statesmen, diplomatic negotiations and Irish affairs form the chief subjects of consideration and are treated in a smoothly running narrative. The history is in general fair and accurate enough, although

not characterized by originality of presentation nor based on extensive research in new materials.

Unhappily the volume is marred in many places by vehement expressions and loose characterizations which seem unworthy of so dignified a work. The philosophic calm of the authors who can write fairly and wisely about Napoleon is apparently disturbed beyond measure by democratic agitation, Irish demands and labor movements. Surely it is not bigotry in a reader to hope that the time was past for writing about "the blood-thirsty orgies of the French revolution ushered in by quixotic visions of liberty, equality and fraternity" (p. 174). Hunt, Cobbett, Major Cartwright and other leaders of the agitation for parliamentary reform are called demagogues with a reiteration that arouses doubt of the authors' scientific tranquillity (p. 175 and *passim*). The unfortunate sufferers at Peterloo are described as "victims of reckless demagoguery no less than of blundering officialism" (p. 178). Hunt was "puffed up with silly vanity" (p. 179) and was a "violent demagogue" besides (p. 318). Cobbett's works were "violent and delusive writings" (p. 204). Trade-unionists were guilty of "wholesale and cruel oppression" (p. 204), but the act of Parliament making the breaking of mining machinery a capital offence does not appear to be mentioned. The safeguards of the Catholic Emancipation Act are described as securities "against Catholic aggression" (p. 247). O'Connell was "the great Irish demagogue" (pp. 313, 374), and was apparently devoid of any decent human qualities. Our authors carry their vehemence almost to the point of the ludicrous (at least to a detached sense of humor) when they speak of O'Connell's "coarse and outrageous vituperation of the nation which had sacrificed even its own conscience to appease Ireland" by the Catholic Relief Act (p. 252). According to their view, "its adoption was a victory of the educated classes, represented by the nomination boroughs, over the unrepresented masses of the people" (p. 248), and Peel's great defence of it rested "solely on grounds of expediency" (p. 246). Chartism and Spencian doctrines are confounded with socialism, with a discrimination almost akin to that of an amiable Oxford lady, who called a friend a socialist because he occasionally read newspapers to the inmates of a blind asylum. Strong adjectives are not often convincing or illuminating in common life, even where warranted. Scholars above all want to know what men did and said rather than to hear them abused, however justly. Surely in the republic of letters belligerent historiography ought to have slight countenance.

CHARLES A. BEARD.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.